EXCHANGE OF LANDS AND ADJUSTMENT OF BOUNDARIES, PLUMAS NATIONAL FOREST, ELDORADO NATIONAL FOREST, STANISLAUS NATIONAL FOREST, SHASTA NATIONAL FOREST, AND TAHOE NATIONAL FOREST

JANUARY 3, 1925.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following report

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 11211]

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11211) to provide for the inclusion of certain lands in the Plumas National Forest, the Eldorado National Forest, the Stanislaus National Forest, the Shasta National Forest, and the Tahoe National Forest, and for other purposes, having considered the same,

report it to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to give authority to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to make exchanges with the owners of privately owned lands within the Plumas National Forest, the Eldorado National Forest, the Stanislaus National Forest, the Shasta National Forest, and the Tahoe National Forest, and within the territory added by the provisions of the bill. This will consolidate the Government holdings and allow the much indented boundaries of these forests to be straightened out. The indentations and projections multiply the problems and cost of the forests and increase the difficulties of fire protection and consistent forest and range management. Within these national forests there are tracts of privately owned land intermingled with the Government holdings. In many instances these disconnected tracts are owned by the same person. Rights to such lands were initiated prior to the establishment of the national forest. The lands were mostly patented under the timber and stone

Most of the areas are of such general character and support such forest cover that they are essentially forest lands and would serve their highest usefulness under Government administration as parts

of the national forest in which they are situated and the lands described which will become a part of the national forest.

In their present unprotected or isolated state the privately owned lands present a fire menace to the adjacent Government lands. Consolidation of the Government holdings by acquisition of these intermingled tracts would materially reduce the danger from fire and would simplify many problems of Government administration. The same condition applies with reference to the lands to be added to each of these national forests set out and described in the bill.

Often such lands are so situated as to embarrass the Government in the ordinary process of administering its own lands and are a hindrance to those who desire the use, under permit, of the national-forest lands for grazing or other purposes. Sometimes such lands are so situated that they present possibilities of endless complications, which could be avoided if the Government were authorized to consolidate its lands through such exchanges, value for value, as

the pending bill contemplates.

Timber-cutting operations on these privately owned lands are frequently conducted without regard to consequent destruction of scenic beauty along important highways, as well as the question of reforestation. The operators want to remove the timber they own. Often, however, where a logging operation would leave an unsightly area of forest devastation along an otherwise beautiful mountain road, timber operators are willing to exchange their holdings for Government timber which may be cut without marring the beauty of the landscape.

If the pending bill should be enacted, the Secretary of Agriculture would have authority to negotiate exchanges which would in some instances operate to reduce the hazard of fire; in some instances eliminate embarrassments of administration in connection with grazing and other permits; in some instances protect from devastation landscapes of great scenic beauty along important highways; and in some instances effect all of these three desirable objects.

If the pending bill is enacted, the Secretary of Agriculture will have authority to obtain title to this privately owned area, exchanging therefor an equal value of land or timber within any national forest

within the State of California.

As the land is now situated the Government is at the expense of assisting in preventing fires on lands within the boundaries of the national forest without any apparent return therefor, whereas when the lands are added and become a part of the national forest the Government will be obtaining revenue for permits issued for grazing such accrued added lands and in addition thereto will be conserving the growing young timber for reforestation and for the protection of stream flow. Practically all of the lands now in private ownership within these national forests, as well as the land described in the bill, was once timberland, but has since been cut over and with proper protection can be in time reforested to the general advantage of the Government. The Government can afford to handle such tracts for reforestation and for the protection of stream flow where the private individual or owner is unable.

The public land within the tracts described is of such character and at such elevation that it is not susceptible of use for agricultural purposes, as it mostly contains a poor grade of small trees and is

otherwise lough and rocky.

It might be stated that considerable revenue will accrue to the Government from grazing permits on lands that it has proposed to place within the national forest, and the addition of the land to the national forest will be advantageous and not a detriment to the Government.

This bill consolidates the provisions of (1) H. R. 103, Union Calendar, No. 233; (2) H. R. 104, Union Calendar, No. 234; (3) H. R. 105, Union Calendar, No. 235; (4) H. R. 106, Union Calendar, No. 236; (5) H. R. 107, Union Calendar, No. 237.

The language contained in lines 3 to 9, page 1, and lines 1 to 8, page 2, is the same as the provisions contained in each of the bills

referred to and heretofore reported.

The provisions of H. R. 11211, subdivision (1), lines 9 to 25, page 2, and lines 1 to 11, page 3, cover the land described in H. R. 103. The bill, H. R. 103, was submitted by the chairman of this committee to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior for a report. Both departments reported favorably thereon. The one amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior has been adopted by the committee.

The reports of both departments are herein set out in full for the information of the House, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 16, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I have received your request for report on H. R. 103, to authorize inclusion of certain lands in the Plumas National Forest, Calif.

Legislation of similar nature was proposed in H. R. 5003 of the Sixty-seventh Congress, and this department submitted report thereon August 25, 1921. The present measure would authorize addition to the forest of lands chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes within the areas therein described, where in private ownership through exchange for an equal value of Government land, or timber in any national forest in the State under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), and where public by proclamation of the President.

March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), and where public by proclamation of the President.

The several areas described adjoin or are in close proximity to the national forest. The records of the General Land Office of this department show that they have an aggregate area of 218,430 acres, which has almost entirely passed

out of public ownership.

There are some scattered tracts of public lands within such areas amounting to approximately 6,790 acres, 670 acres thereof being unsurveyed and 510 acres under withdrawal for power-site purposes, and a few unperfected entries or

selections

As provision is made that the lands to be surrendered, or the those added from the public domain must be chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes, I have no objection to the enactment of the bill. Under its terms lands embraced in existing entries would be protected in event of inclusion in the forest by proclamation, but such exception is not broad enough to cover settlements or other claims which may have attached to the lands under the public land laws. In order to protect such claims, and the power-site withdrawals referred to, I would recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "entries," in line 1 of page 2, and substituting therefor "claims and the provisions of existing withdrawals."

Reference of the measure to the Secretary of Agriculture is suggested, as he is primarily interested in the exchange proposed.

Very truly yours,

E. C. FINNEY, Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Washington, January 7, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. SINNOTT: Reference is made to your request of December 18 for a report upon the bill (H. R. 103) for the inclusion of certain lands in the Plumas National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes.

The act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stats. 465), known as the general exchange law,

authorizes the acceptance of the title from private ownership of lands within the exterior boundaries of the national forest and the giving in exchange of nationalforest land or timber within the same State. The bill which is now presented would amend that act so that certain lands along the outside of the boundaries of the Plumas National Forest could be offered the Government under the

general exchange proviso.

From sources of information in the Forest Service it is learned that much of the area described in the bill is chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes and would serve its highest use as parts of administrative units within this forest. The reasons why the boundary line was not originally extended to cover these portions is that the lands had been acquired by private persons prior to the time the national forest was established, because of their great timber values. The bill would not in itself add the lands but would authorize the department to examine the areas upon application and to accept offers of private persons who would be given in exchange certain other lands or timber within the boundaries of some national forest in California. Some of the tracts described in the measure are still in Government ownership. If, therefore, blocks of privately owned lands were acquired, the intermingled public lands could also be added if they were chiefly valuable for national forest-purposes, thus more effectively consolidating the addition.

It is noted that the bill closely follows the form of the act of September 22, 1922 (Public, 359), authorizing similar additions to three national forests within the State of Washington. The department has found that legislation of this character is very largely in the public interests and helps simplify many administrative problems on natural units for forest administration, and therefore

recommends favorable consideration of the bill by your committee.

Very truly yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, Secretary.

The provisions of H. R. 11211, subdivision (2), lines 12 to 24, page 3, and lines 1 and 2, page 4, cover the land described in H. R. 104. The bill, H. R. 104 was submitted by the chairman of this committee to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior for a report. Both departments reported favorably thereon. The one amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior has been adopted by the committee.

The reports of both departments are herein set out in full for the information of the House, as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 16, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I am in receipt of your request for report on H. R. 104, proposing to authorize additions to the Eldorado National Forest in Cali-

fornia under certain conditions.

The bill would provide for the inclusion in the forest of any lands chiefly valuable for national forest purposes within the area therein described, either through exchange under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), where in private ownership or where public by proclamation of the President. In purpose the measure is similar to H. R. 8263, introduced in the first session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, which contained, however, a provision authorizing a special exchange, as the general forest consolidation law of March 20, 1922, had not then been enacted.

The records of this department show that the lands involved, aggregating 130,517 acres, adjoin different portions of the forest, are surveyed, and for the most part embraced in final and unperfected entries and selections under the public land laws. The unappropriated public lands are scattered and amount to 12,820 acres, 3,240 acres of which are included in withdrawals for power site

and reclamation purposes.

This department has no objection to the legislation proposed as provision is made that the lands to be surrendered or added from the public domain must be chiefly valuable for national forest purposes. Provision is made in the bill to protect existing entries where public lands shall be included in the forest, but such exception is not broad enough to coverset tlements or other claims, which may have attached to the lands under the public land laws. In order to protect such claims and the reclamation and power-site withdrawals above mentioned, I would recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "entries" in line 1 of page 2 and substituting therefor "claims and provisions of existing

Reference of the bill to the Secretary of Agriculture is suggested, as he is

primarily interested in the exchange proposed.

Very truly yours,

E. C. FINNEY, Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Washington, January 17, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Sinnott: Reference is made to your request of December 18 for report on bill H. R. 104, for the inclusion of certain lands in the Eldorado National

Forest, Calif., and for other purposes.

The act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), known as the general exchange law, authorizes the acceptance of title from private owners of land within the exterior boundaries of national forests and the giving in exchange therefor of equal values of national forest land or timber within the same State. The bill H. R. 104 would extend the provisions of that act to certain lands outside of, but adjoining, the boundaries of the Eldorado National Forest. Most of the area described in the bill is chiefly valuable for national forest purposes and would serve its highest use as parts of administrative units within the Eldorado National Forest. Some of the lands were logged over some 40 to 60 years ago and the timber taken to Virginia City, Nev. They now contain a good second-growth stand of timber. Others of these lands still support good stands of merchantable of timber. Others of these lands still support good stands of merchantable timber. The only reason the boundary line was not originally extended to cover the area described was that so much of it had been acquired by private owners because of timber values prior to the time the national forest was established. The bill would not in itself add the lands to the forest, but would authorize the department to examine the areas upon application and to accept offers of private the desired to secure in exchange certain other lands or timber of equal owners who desired to secure in exchange certain other lands or timber of equal value within the boundaries of some national forest in California. A few of the tracts described are still in Government ownership. If, therefore, blocks of privately owned lands were acquired the intermingled public lands should also be added, thus more effectively consolidating the addition.

It is noted that the bill closely follows the form of the act of September 22, 1922 (Public 359), authorizing similar additions to three national forests within the State of Washington. The department has found legislation of this character very largely in the public interest, as the consolidation of natural units of forest administration greatly simplifies administration and increases the value and effectiveness of the properties now held in public ownership for purposes of forest protection. It, therefore, recommends favorable consideration of the bill

by your committee.

Very truly yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, Secretary.

The provisions of H. R. 11211, subdivision (3) lines 3 to 15, page 4, cover the lands described in H. R. 105. The bill, H. R. 105 was submitted by the chairman of this committee to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior for a report. Both departments reported favorably thereon. The one amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior has been adopted by the committee.

H R-68-2-vol 1-21

The reports of both departments are herein set out in full for the information of the House, as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 16, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I am in receipt of your request for report on H. R. 105, proposing to authorize additions to the Stanislaus National Forest in Cali-

fornia under certain conditions. A similar measure, H. R. 8976, was introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress, and this department submitted a report thereon under date of January 12, 1922. The present bill would provide for the inclusion in the forest of any lands chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes within the area therein described either through exchange under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), where in private

ownership or where public by proclamation of the President.

The records of this department show that the lands involved, aggregating approximately 75,551 acres, adjoin the forest on the west, are surveyed, and for the most part embraced in final and unperfected entries and selections under the public land laws. The unappropriated public lands are scattered and amount to about 13,160 acres, 4,500 acres of which are included in power-site withdrawals.

This department has no objection to the legislation proposed, as provision is made that the lands to be surrendered or added from the public domain must be chiefly valuable for national forest purposes. Under the terms of the bill lands embraced in existing entries would be protected in event of their inclusion in the forest by proclamation, but such exception is not broad enough to cover settlements or other claims which may have attached to the lands under the public land laws. In order to protect such claims and the power-site withdrawals above mentioned, I would recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "entries" in line 2 of page 2 and substituting therefor "claims and provisions of existing withdrawals.

Reference of the bill to the Secretary of Agriculture is suggested, as he is

primarily interested in the exchange proposed.

Very truly yours,

E. C. FINNEY, Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Washington, January 7, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SINNOTT: Reference is made to your request of December 18 for a report upon the bill (H. R. 105) for the inclusion of certain lands in the Stanislaus

report upon the bill (H. R. 105) for the metasion of textual National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes.

The act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stats. 465), known as the general exchange law, authorizes the acceptance of the title from private ownership of lands within the exterior boundaries of the national forest and the giving in exchange of the land or timber within the same State. The bill which is now national forest land or timber within the same State. The bill which is now presented would amend that act so that certain lands along the outside of the boundary of the Stanislaus National Forest could be offered the Government

under the general exchange proviso.

From sources of information in the Forest Service it is learned that much of the area described in the bill is chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes and would reasons why the boundary line was not originally extended to cover these portions is that the lands had been acquired by private persons prior to the time the national forest was established, because of their great timber values. The bill does not in itself add the lands but washed and been acquired by the scale of their great timber values. does not in itself add the lands, but would authorize the department to examine the areas upon application, and to accept offers of private persons who would be given in exchange certain other lands or timber within the boundaries of some national forest in California. Some of the tracts described in the measure are still in Government ownership. If, therefore, blocks of privately owned lands were acquired, the intermingled public lands could also be added if they were chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes, thus more effectively consolidating the addition.

It is noted that the bill closely follows the form of the act of September 22, 1922 (Public, 359), authorizing similar additions to three national forests within the State of Washington. The department has found that legislation of this character is very largely in the public interests and helps simplify many administrative problems on natural units for forest administration, and therefore recommends favorable consideration of the bill by your committee.

Very truly yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, Secretary.

The provisions of H. R. 11211, subdivision (4), lines 16 to 25, page 4, page 5, and lines 1 to 14, page 6, cover the lands described in H. R. 106. The bill, H. R. 106 was submitted by the chairman of this committee to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior for a report. Both departments reported favorably thereon. The one amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior has been adopted by the committee.

The reports of both departments are herein set out in full for the

information of the House, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 16, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

House of Representatives.

My Dear Mr. Sinnott: I have received your request for report on H. R. 106, to authorize additions to the Shasta National Forest, Calif., under certain conditions.

Legislation of similar purpose was proposed in H. R. 5004 and 13319 in the Sixty-seventh Congress, and this department submitted report upon the former measure under date of August 25, 1921. The present bill would authorize inclusion in the forest of lands chiefly valuable for national forest purposes within the area therein described, either through exchange for an equal value of Government land or timber in any national forest in the State under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), where in private ownership or where public by proclamation of the President.

The records of the General Land Office show that the described areas adjoin different divisions of the Shasta Forest, aggregating over 515,000 acres, and have almost entirely passed out of public ownership largely under the timber and stone law. There are some small scattered tracts of unappropriated public land within such areas, amounting to 12,740 acres, partly unsurveyed, and a small portion withdrawn for power-site purposes, and a few unperfected entries of selections. As provision is made that the lands to be surrendered or added from the public

As provision is made that the lands to be surrendered or added from the public domain must be chiefly valuable for national forest purposes, I have no objection to the legislation proposed. Under the terms of the bill lands embraced in existing entries would be protected in event of inclusion of public lands in the forest, but such exception is not broad enough to cover settlements or other claims which may have attached to the lands under the public land laws. In order to protect such claims and the power-site withdrawals referred to I would recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "entries" in line 14 of page 1 and substituting therefor "claims and the provisions of existing withdrawals."

Reference of the measure to the Secretary of Agriculture is also suggested, as he is primarily interested in the exchange proposed.

Very truly yours,

E. C. FINNEY, Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Washington, January 3, 1924.

Hon. N. J. Sinnott, Chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SINNOTT. Reference is made to your request of December 18 for a report upon the bill (H. R. 106) for the exclusion of certain lands in the Shasta National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes.

This measure is identical with the bill (H. R. 13319) which was before your committee in the Sixty-seventh Congress and upon which the department submitted a report on January 22, 1923. In expressing its views at that time the

department stated:

The act of March 20, 1922 (Public, 173), known as the general exchange law, authorizes the acceptance of title from private owners of lands within the exterior boundaries of national forests and the giving in exchange of national forest land or timber within the same State. The bill which you now present would amend that act so that certain lands along the outside of the boundaries of the Shasta National Forest could be offered the Government under the general exchange provisions. From sources of information in the Forest Service, it is learned that much of the area described in the bill is chiefly valuable for national forest purposes and would serve its highest use as parts of administrative units within this forest. The reason why the boundary line was not originally extended to cover these portions is that the lands had been acquired by private persons because of timber values prior to the time the national forest was established. The bill would not in itself add the lands, but would authorize the department to examine the areas upon application and to accept offers of private persons who would be given in exchange certain selections within the boundaries of some national forest in California. Some of the tracts described are still in Government ownership. If, therefore, blocks of privately owned lands were acquired, the intermingled public lands could also be added, thus more effectively consolidating the addition.

"It is noted that the bill closely follows the form of the act of September 22, 1922 (Public, 359), authorizing similar additions to three national forests within the State of Washington. The department has found legislation of this character is very largely in the public interests and helps simplify many administrative problems on natural units for forest administration and therefore recommends

favorable consideration of the bill by your committee.

In view of the foregoing, the department renews its recommendations that the bill receive favorable consideration by your committee.

Very truly yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, Secretary.

The provisions of H. R. 11211, subdivision (5), lines 15 to 25, page 6, and lines 1 to 18, page 7, cover the lands described in H. R. 107. The bill H. R. 107 was submitted by the chairman of this committee to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior for a report. Both departments reported favorably thereon. The one amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior has been adopted by the committee.

The reports of both departments are herein set out in full for the information of the House, as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 16, 1924.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives.

My Dear Mr. Sinnott: I have received your request for report on H. R. 107, proposing to authorize additions to the Tahoe National Forest in California and

Nevada, under certain conditions.

Similar measures, H. R. Nos. 6651 and 13320, were introduced in the Sixtyseventh Congress, and this department submitted a report upon the former measure under date of August 25, 1921. The present measure would provide for inclusion in the forest of any lands chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes within the areas therein described, either through exchange under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), amended as proposed therein, where in private

ownership, or where public by proclamation of the President.

Exchanges under the general forest consolidation laws are optional with the Government, which may give an equal value of Government land, or timber in any national forest in the same State in exchange for reconveyed lands in a

national forest chiefly valuable for forest purposes.

Under the proviso in the present measure the exchanges authorized by said act within the present boundaries of the Tahoe National Forest in California and Nevada, and those proposed to be authorized within the areas in such States described in the bill described in the bill, would not be so restricted and the lands or timber given in exchange for reconveyed land in one State might be located in either California

or Nevada. While there would be no objection on the part of the Government to this provision, it is thought that it may be objectionable to such States because of the inequality in the distribution of taxable lands which might result therefrom.

The areas over which the present measure would extend the provisions of the general forest exchange law, as amended, join the forest on the north, east, and west, and Lake Tahoe on the east. The records of the General Land Office show that such areas aggregate 281,165 acres, 203,305 acres being in California and 77,860 acres in Nevada, and that such areas have almost entirely passed out of public ownership. The unappropriated public lands are scattered tracts and amount to approximately 5,900 acres in California and 2,500 acres in Nevada, and such lands in California are largely under power-site withdrawal, and those in Nevada are chiefly under reclamation withdrawal. This department has no objection to the legislation proposed, as provision is made that the lands to be surrendered or added from the public domain must be chiefly valuable for national-forest purposes. Under the terms of the bill lands embraced in existing entries would be protected in event of inclusion in the forest by proclamation, but such exception is not broad enough to cover settlements or other claims which may have attached to the lands under the public land laws. In order to protect such claims and the reclamation and power-site withdrawals above mentioned, I would recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "entries" in line 5 of page 2 and substituting therefor "claims and provisions of existing withdrawals."

Reference of the bill to the Secretary of Agriculture is suggested, as he is

primarily interested in the exchange proposed.

Very truly yours,

E. C. FINNEY, Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Washington, January 3, 1924.

Hon. N. J. Sinnott,

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Sinnott: Reference is made to your request of December 18 for a report upon the bill, H. R. 107, for the inclusion of certain lands in the Tahoe National Forest, in the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes.

This bill is identical with H. R. 13320, which was before your committee in the Sixty-seventh Congress and upon which the department submitted a report on January 22, 1923. In expressing its views upon that measure the department stated as follows:

"The act of March 20, 1922 (Public 173), known as the general exchange law, authorizes the acceptance of title from private owners of lands within the exterior boundaries of national forests and the giving in exchange of national forest land or timber within the same State. The bill which you now present would amend that act so that certain lands along the outside of the boundaries of the Tahoe National Forest could be offered the Government under the general

exchange provisions.

"The Tahoe National Forest is situated partly within both California and Nevada. From information of record in the Forest Service it is shown that much of the area described in the bill is chiefly valuable for national forest purposes and would serve its highest use as parts of administrative units within this forest. The reason why the boundary line was not originally extended to cover these portions is that the lands had been acquired by private persons because of timber values prior to the time the national forest was established. The bill would not in itself add the lands but would authorize the department to examine the areas and to accept offers of private persons who could be given in exchange an equal value of land or timber within any national forest in either the States of Nevada or California. Some of the tracts described are still in Government ownership. If blocks of privately owned lands are acquired the public lands can also be added, thus more effectively consolidating the addition.

"It is noted that the bill very closely follows the form of the act of September 22, 1922 (Public 359), authorizing similar additions to three national forests within the State of Washington. The department has found that legislation of this character is very largely in the public interest and helps simplify many administrative problems on natural units for forest administration and, therefore,

recommends favorble consideration of the measure by your committee."

The department would therefore renew its recommendation that this bill be favorably considered by your committee.

Very truly yours,